

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
DATED JUNE 2, 2005

Appln. No. 10/849,746

- 9 -

August 10, 2005

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2005. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Acknowledgment of Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, that Claims 7-11, 21 and 23-28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the recitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims upon which they depend.

Summary of the Rejections

Claims 1-3, 13-20, 29, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,532,837 to Cushenbery et al. Claims 29-32 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,985,963 to Lee. Claims 4-6 are rejected as obvious over Cushenbery et al. Claims 12 and 22 are rejected as obvious over Cushenbery et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,020,401 to Jiles.

Summary of Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended Claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of allowable Claim 9 therein, canceling Claim 9. Applicants assert that, consistent with the Examiner's remarks, Claim 1 as amended is allowable. Applicants have further amended Claims 10 and 11 to depend upon Claim 1, consistent with cancellation of Claim 9. Minor amendments have also been made to Claims 3-6, 12, 13 and 15 for consistency with the amendments to Claim 1. Claims 2-8 and

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
DATED JUNE 2, 2005

Appln. No. 10/849,746

- 10 -

August 10, 2005

10-15 all depend, either directly or indirectly, upon Claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable.

Applicants have further amended Claim 16 to include the subject matter of allowable Claim 23, canceling Claim 23. Applicants further assert that amended Claim 16 is allowable, consistent with the Examiner's remarks. Applicants have also amended Claims 24-27 by changing their dependency to Claim 16 consistent with cancellation of Claim 23. Minor amendments have also been made to Claims 18 and 22 for consistency with the amendments to Claim 16. Applicants further note that Claims 17-22 and 24-28 depend, either directly or indirectly, upon Claim 16 and should, therefore, be allowable for the same reasons that Claim 16 is allowable.

Applicants have canceled the Claims 29-33 without prejudice.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants include herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed pursuant to their duty of disclosure.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
DATED JUNE 2, 2005

Appln. No. 10/849,746

- 11 -

August 10, 2005

Summary

Applicants respectfully contend that the claim amendments place the application in condition for allowance consistent with the Examiner's remarks in the Action. Applicants, therefore, request that the application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP

By:



John A. Chionchio  
Reg. No. 40,954

1101 Market Street, Suite 2600  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

JAC/dml  
Enclosures